

Ovarian carcinoma-associated mesenchymal stem cells arise from tissue-specific normal stroma

Coffman, Lan G^{1,2*}, Pearson, Alexander T^{3*}, Frisbie, Leonard G¹, Freeman, Zachary⁴, Christie, Elizabeth⁵, Bowtell, David D⁵, and Buckanovich, Ronald J^{1,2}

¹Division of Hematology Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine,

²Division of Gynecologic Oncology, Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Hillman Cancer Center, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA, USA.

³Division of Hematology Oncology, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Chicago, IL.

⁴Unit for Laboratory Animal Medicine, Rogel Cancer Center, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI

⁵Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre, Parkville, VIC, Australia

*Co-first authorship

Corresponding Author:

Lan G. Coffman, MD, PhD,
University of Pittsburgh
Magee Women's Research Institute
204 Craft Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15213
Phone (412)641-2016
Fax (412)641-2458
coffmanl@upmc.edu

Lan Coffman: Conception and design, financial support, collection and/or assemble of data, data analysis and interpretation, manuscript writing

Alex Pearson: Conception and design, data analysis and interpretation, manuscript writing

Leonard Frisbie: Collection and/or assembly of data

Zachary Freeman: Collection and/or assembly of data, data analysis and interpretation

Elizabeth Christie: Collection and/or assembly of data, data analysis and interpretation

David Bowtell: Provision of study material or patients, collection and/or assembly of data

Ronald Buckanovich: Conception and design, financial support, manuscript writing

Running title: CA-MSCs arise from tissue-specific normal stroma

Key words: Ovarian cancer, mesenchymal stem cell, tumor microenvironment, hypoxia

Acknowledgments: This work was supported in part by the NCI/NIH1-R01-211913-02 L.

This is the author manuscript accepted for publication and has undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/stem.2932](https://doi.org/10.1002/stem.2932)

Coffman is supported by a NCI/NIH 7K08CA211362 award and American Society of Clinical Oncology's Young Investigator Award and the Hillman Fellows Program. A.T. Pearson is supported by the Cancer Research Foundation Young Investigator Award.

Disclosures: D.B. declared research support from Roche-Genentech and AstraZeneca. R.B. declared a leadership position with Tradewind Biosciences and 2 patents with the University of Michigan. All other authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Abstract

Carcinoma-associated mesenchymal stem cells (CA-MSCs) are critical stromal progenitor cells within the tumor microenvironment. We previously demonstrated that CA-MSCs differentially express BMP family members, promote tumor cell growth, increase cancer 'stemness' and chemotherapy resistance. Here we use RNA sequencing of normal omental MSCs and ovarian CA-MSCs to demonstrate global changes in CA-MSC gene expression. Using these expression profiles, we create a unique predictive algorithm to classify CA-MSCs. Our classifier accurately distinguishes normal omental, ovary and bone marrow MSCs from ovarian cancer CA-MSCs. Suggesting broad applicability, the model correctly classifies pancreatic and endometrial cancer CA-MSCs and distinguishes cancer associated fibroblasts (CAFs) from CA-MSCs.

Using this classifier, we definitively demonstrate ovarian CA-MSCs arise from tumor mediated reprogramming of local tissue MSCs. While cancer cells alone cannot induce a CA-MSC phenotype, the *in vivo* ovarian tumor microenvironment (TME) can reprogram omental or ovary MSCs to protumorigenic CA-MSCs (classifier score of >0.96). *In vitro* studies suggest that both tumor secreted factors and hypoxia are critical to induce the CA-MSC phenotype. Interestingly, while the breast cancer TME can reprogram BM MSCs into CA-MSCs, the ovarian TME cannot, demonstrating for the first time that tumor mediated CA-MSC conversion is tissue and cancer type dependent. Together these findings (1) provide a critical tool to define CA-MSCs and (2) highlight cancer cell influence on distinct normal tissues providing powerful insights into the mechanisms underlying cancer specific metastatic niche formation.

Introduction:

High grade serous ovarian cancer cells (HGSOC) have a striking predilection for the intra-peritoneal microenvironment with >70% of women presenting with intra-peritoneal metastasis [1]. The ovarian tumor microenvironment (TME) is not a passive backdrop but an active “organ” significantly altering cancer growth, survival and spread [2-4]. One critical component of the ovarian TME is the mesenchymal stem cell (MSC).

MSCs reside in nearly every tissue in the body including the bone marrow, omentum and ovary, playing critical roles in wound healing and tissue repair [5, 6]. Carcinoma associated MSCs (CA-MSC) are distinct from normal tissue MSCs with a unique expression profile and protumorigenic functions [2, 7]. CA-MSCs fulfill all the criteria for MSCs posed by the International Society for Cellular Therapy (ISCT): 1) plastic adherence 2) CD105, 90, 73 positivity and CD45, CD34, CD14, CD19, HLA-DR negativity and 3) capacity to differentiate into at least two mesenchymal-derived cell types [8]. CA-MSCs do not have malignant potential and do not harbor tumor-associated mutational changes such as p53 mutations (found in > 90% of all high grade serous ovarian tumors), thus CA-MSCs are not derived directly from tumor cells [2, 9]. As true stromal progenitor cells, CA-MSCs differentiate into important stromal components such as cancer

associated fibroblasts (CAFs) and adipocytes and may play a critical role in influencing the formation and function of the entire TME.

CA-MSCs, compared to normal tissue MSCs, have a distinct expression profile characterized by high expression of Transforming Growth Factor Beta (TGF β) super family members which mediates their pro-tumorigenic functions including tumor growth promotion, enrichment of cancer stem-like cells (CSCs) and induction of chemotherapy resistance [2, 7]. Thus understanding and targeting CA-MSCs has the potential to significantly impact ovarian cancer progression. Indeed, we recently described a tumor derived hedgehog (Hh) and CA-MSC derived Bone Morphogenetic Protein 4 (BMP4) signaling loop which, when interrupted, led to drastic tumor cell chemo-sensitization and regression of established cisplatin-resistant tumors [7].

CA-MSCs clearly influence the ovarian TME, however a fundamental question remains unanswered: what is the origin of CA-MSCs? As MSCs are highly migratory, CA-MSCs could be a unique population of normal MSCs recruited to the TME or could be resident cells induced into a protumorigenic phenotype. Identifying the origin of CA-MSCs is critical to targeting these pivotal stromal stem cells thus potentially disrupting the formation of the TME at an early stage when therapies may be most effective.

Previously we reported that cancer cell secreted factors influence the expression profile of normal tissue MSCs [2]. We thus hypothesized that the protumorigenic CA-MSC phenotype may be

induced via “cancer stimulation”. To date, only select expression changes and specific signaling pathways have been described in MSC:tumor cell interactions. We performed RNA sequencing of normal MSCs and CA-MSCs and demonstrate global expression changes in CA-MSCs. We then used RNASeq data to develop a 6 gene CA-MSC classifier that accurately differentiates normal MSCs from ovarian CA-MSCs. Using this classifier, we demonstrate that normal ovarian and normal omental derived MSCs (OV MSCs, OM MSCs) can be induced by ovarian cancer to become CA-MSCs. Interestingly, the capacity to become a CA-MSC is tissue source and cancer type dependent as MSCs from bone marrow (BM MSCs) fail to acquire ovarian cancer promoting properties; however, with breast cancer stimulation, BM MSCs develop a CA-MSC phenotype strongly promoting breast cancer growth. Importantly, the CA-MSC classifier accurately predicts CA-MSC protumorigenic function including induction of tumor cell chemotherapy resistance, enhancement of CSCs and promotion of *in vivo* tumor growth. A combination of tumor secreted factors and other influences in the TME such as hypoxia appear to drive the CA-MSC phenotype.

Results:

Creation of an ovarian CA-MSC classifier. We previously described a unique CA-MSC expression profile based on an 84-gene qRT-PCR microarray expression platform [2]. To comprehensively define the CA-MSC expression profile, we performed RNA sequencing on CA-MSCs derived from (i) surgical resection of omental metastatic deposits of ovarian cancer (largely

high grade serous ovarian cancer) and (ii) normal omental derived MSCs (MSCs derived from omental tissue of women undergoing benign gynecologic surgery). K-means clustering and principal components regression demonstrated clear differences in the expression patterns of CA-MSCs vs OM MSCs. Figure 1 shows the unsupervised hierarchical clustering of CA-MSC vs OM MSCs RNAseq data (Fig1A), principle component analysis of RNAseq data (Fig1B) and correlation plotting of gene enrichment scores of the top 25 differentially expressed genes from RNAseq analysis (green dots= positive correlations, red dots= negative correlations) (Fig1C). Consistent with our previous findings [2, 7], bone morphogenetic protein 2 (BMP2), platelet-derived growth factor receptor beta (PDGFRb), leukemia inhibitor factor (LIF) and T-box 5 (TBX5) were significantly differentially expressed in CA-MSCs vs OM MSCs in both the RNAseq data (Fig1C) and independent qRT-PCR validation (Fig1D).

RNA sequencing data was used to determine differential gene expression enrichment via the Sergushichev fast algorithm in CA-MSCs compared to OM MSCs. At the <0.05 adjusted p-value level, 27 genes were identified which discriminated between CA-MSCs and OM MSCs.

Individual RT-PCR was performed on an additional 10 independent patient CA-MSCs and 8 independent patient OM MSCs for each gene in the gene enrichment set (GES) to validate the RNAseq data. Two genes, CLND1 and EVPL, failed independent validation and were excluded resulting in a final 25-gene GES (Fig1C,D). The CA-MSC and OM MSC independently validated expression data (from the 10 independent patient CA-MSCs and 8 independent patient OM MSCs above), represented as the delta CT value of the mRNA expression compared to GAPDH, was

divided into a testing and training group. Samples were randomly divided using random number (0 or 1) generation. Each group contained 5 CA-MSCs and 4 OM MSCs. Cross-validated constrained (LASSO) logistic regression modeling was applied. This method created a parsimonious model seeking to minimize misclassification error that predicts the probability of being a CA-MSC vs MSC (supFig1). The sum of regression coefficients*gene PCR expression is logistically transformed yielding a score between 0 and 1 of how likely the sample is a “CA-MSC.” Scores closest to 1 have the highest probability of being a CA-MSC and scores closest to 0 have the lowest probability of being a CA-MSC (or conversely, the most likely to be a normal MSC). Scores close to 0.5 are the least reliably interpreted due to the shape of the logistic curve and potential for small noise in the model translating to large change in score. The final model incorporated expression data from 6 genes: Annexin A8-like protein 2 (ANXA8L2), Collagen Type XV Alpha 1 Chain (COL15A1), Cytokine Receptor Like Factor 1 (CRLF1), GATA Binding Protein 4 (GATA4), Iroquois Homeobox 2 (IRX2), and Transforming Growth Factor Beta 2 (TGFB2). A 5-gene vs 6-gene LASSO model without and with TGFb had equal misclassification error. The TGFb super family of proteins are functionally important in MSC biology and BMP 2 and 4 are particularly important in tumor cell:CA-MSC interactions, thus we choose to leave this gene incorporated given equivalency in model performance. We henceforth refer to this model as the CA-MSC classifier.

We tested the robustness of the classifier in distinguishing independent OM MSC and CA-MSC samples. The classifier accurately identified five new independent patient OM MSC samples as

“not a CA-MSC” with an average score of 0.04 and eight new independent patient CA-MSC samples as “CA-MSCs” with an average classifier score >0.99 . With an average score of >0.99 (n=3 patients) CA-MSCs derived from primary ovary tumors (rather than metastatic deposits) were also accurately classified as “CA-MSCs”. We further tested the classifier using normal MSCs from ovary and bone marrow. Bone marrow MSCs and ovary MSCs (n=3 each), with classifier scores of 0.16 and 0.18 respectively, were accurately classified as “not CA-MSCs”. With an inherent threshold value of 0.5, the CA-MSC classifier achieved 100% accuracy. Moreover, while the model was generated with a 0.5 threshold, the extremes (closest to 1 or 0) carry the most precision and are therefore the most reliable. The greatest variability exists surrounding the 0.5 threshold therefor classifier scores around this number are the least reliable. To provide easier determination of what is reliably predicted as a CA-MSC vs normal MSC, we choose to set a boundary at 0.96 which is 2 standard deviations below the average CA-MSC score (average=0.99, standard deviation=0.015) as reliably a CA-MSC. Conversely, for normal MSCs (omentum, ovary, BM), the score 2 standard deviations above the average was 0.3 (average=0.11, standard deviation=0.09) and this was used as an upper boundary to reliably classify a normal MSC. We also characterized CA-MSCs from endometrial cancer (n=2 patients) and pancreatic cancer (n=3 patients) which were classified as “CA-MSCs” with scores of 0.96 and 0.99 respectively. Confirming MSCs are distinct from cancer associated fibroblasts (CAFs), ovarian and omental tumor tissue derived CAFs (n=2, one from omental tissue, one from ovarian tissue) yielded a classifier score of 0.56 which has a low probability of reflecting either a normal MSC or a CA-MSCs profile (Fig2C).

Ovarian cancer cells partially induce OM and OV MSCs to assume a CA-MSC expression profile.

To determine if cancer cells reprogram normal MSCs into CA-MSCs, we first performed *in vitro* direct and indirect co-culture experiments using normal MSCs and ovarian cancer cells. Normal BM MSCs, OM MSCs, or OV MSCs from three different patients per cell type were cultured with three ovarian cancer cell lines --SKOV3 (endometrioid), CAOV3 and PEO1 (high grade serous). Co-cultured MSCs were isolated and mRNA expression applied to the CA-MSC classifier. Previously validated differentially expressed mRNAs were also assessed (supFig2) [2]. While some genes showed altered expression (Fig 3 A-F), indirect co-culture of MSCs and tumor cells did not induce a CA-MSC expression profile in any of the MSC populations with classifier scores ranging from 0.12- 0.22 (SEM<0.09).

We next determined if direct co-culture, allowing both secreted and cell-contact dependent interactions, could induce the formation of a CA-MSC. mTomato (mT) labeled BM MSCs, OM MSC or OV MSCs were co-cultured with ovarian cancer cells, FACS isolated and mRNA expression applied to the CA-MSC classifier. While more genes approximated expression observed in CA-MSCs, cancer cell stimulation via direct co-culture demonstrate limited induction of a CA-MSC phenotype with a classifier scores of 0.17 (SEM=0.03) for BM MSC, and 0.55 (SEM=0.12) for OV MSC. Direct cancer stimulation of OM MSCs (D-CS OM MSC) most closely approximated a CA-MSC, with a classifier score of 0.87 (SEM=0.13). Several critical components of the signature were missing including changes in ANXA8L2 and TGF-b (Fig3, Fig5C).

Hypoxia enhances the induction of a CA-MSC. We considered what other factors in the TME may influence the induction of a CA-MSC. One hallmark of the TME [10, 11] which impacts normal MSC morphology, proliferation, and differentiation is hypoxia [12]. Hypoxia is known to increase TGF- β signaling and GATA4 expression, genes upregulated in CA-MSCs [13-17]. CA-MSCs demonstrated higher transcript and protein levels of hypoxia inducible factor alpha (HIF1 α) and indirect cancer stimulation induced HIF1 α expression in OM MSCs (Fig4B). Interestingly, OM MSCs and CA-MSCs grew slower and spontaneously formed spheroids under hypoxic conditions (1% oxygen) (Fig4A). We tested the impact of hypoxia on the induction of a CA-MSC profile *in vitro*. Indirect and direct co-cultures as described above were repeated under hypoxic (1% oxygen) conditions. MSCs were isolated and mRNA expression data was applied to the CA-MSC classifier. Hypoxia alone did not significantly alter normal MSCs (classifier score 0.2 (SEM0.05)). Indirect and direct co-culture under hypoxic conditions (I^{Hyp}-CS, D^{Hyp}-CS respectively) yielded classifier scores of: 0.08 for I^{Hyp}-CS BM MSC and 0.03 for D^{Hyp}-CS BM MSC, 0.63 for I^{Hyp}-CS OM MSC and 0.86 for D^{Hyp}-CS OM MSC, and 0.35 for I^{Hyp}-CS OV MSC and 0.95 for D^{Hyp}-CS OV MSC (Fig4, Fig5C). Thus, hypoxia enhanced CA-MSC induction in OV and OM MSC, but not BM MSC.

In vivo co-culture effectively reprograms normal MSC into CA-MSC. We next determined if *in vivo* growth of normal MSCs with ovarian cancer cells fully induces a CA-MSC expression

profile. mTomato labeled OM, OV and BM MSCs were grown with GFP-labeled CAOV3 or PEO1 tumor cells in mouse xenografts. Tumors were resected and MSCs re-isolated (via FACS on mT+ cells). Re-isolated MSCs were analyzed to confirm they still met MSC-defining criteria outlined by the ISCT [8] (CD105+, 90+, 73+, 44+; CD45-, 34-, 14-, 19-) and capacity to differentiate into adipocytes, osteocytes and chondrocytes. Less than 1% of cells expressed fibroblast surface protein (FSP) or fibroblast activation protein (FAP) verifying absence of fibroblast contamination (SupFig4). To ensure no tumor contamination or malignant transformation, 1×10^6 re-isolated MSCs were injected into mice and monitored for tumor growth for 6 months without tumor initiation.

In vivo cancer stimulation (IV-CS) of OM and OV MSCs resulted in induction of a CA-MSC profile (Fig 5, supFig 2) with a IV-CS OM MSC classifier score of 0.98 (SEM=0.01) and IV-CS OV MSC classifier score of 0.97 (SEM=0.02). TGF β expression changes did not reach CA-MSC levels however. In contrast, BM MSCs inhibited xenograft growth when mixed with CAOV3 or PEO1 tumor cells and no viable BM MSCs could be re-isolated.

CA-MSC classification corresponds with protumorigenic CA-MSC functions. The distinct expression profile of CA-MSCs corresponds with unique protumorigenic functions: (i) CA-MSCs increase the CSC pool as marked by increased levels of ALDH and enhanced tumor sphere formation [2], and CA-MSCs enhance (ii) tumor growth and (iii) chemotherapy resistance [7]. We therefore determined if cancer stimulated OM MSCs classified as CA-MSCs also developed CA-MSC-associated pro-tumorigenic functions. We first tested the effects of cancer-

stimulated OM MSCs on chemotherapy resistance. Cancer stimulated OM MSCs were grown with GFP+ PEO1 cells (BRCA1 mutant platinum-sensitive line) or GFP+ CAOV3 cells (BRCA wild type, intermediate platinum-sensitivity) [18, 19] and treated with cisplatin. Cisplatin treatment of cancer cells grown alone, with patient derived CA-MSCs or with control OM MSCs (OM MSCs without cancer stimulation) served as comparators. Control OM MSCs did not significantly impact cancer cell cisplatin sensitivity while cancer stimulated OM MSCs enhanced cancer cell cisplatin resistance to a degree proportional to their CA-MSC classifier score (Fig6). I-CS OM MSCs (classifier score of 0.15) did not significantly enhance CAOV3 or PEO1 chemotherapy resistance (Fig6A). However, I^{Hyp}-CS OM MSCs (classifier score of 0.63) began to enhance chemotherapy resistance, especially at higher concentrations of cisplatin (Fig6A). Similarly, D-CS OM MSCs and D^{Hyp}-CS OM MSCs (classifier scores of 0.87 and 0.86 respectively) enhanced chemotherapy resistance (Fig6B). IV-CS OM MSCs (classifier score of 0.98) enhanced the chemo-resistance of platinum sensitive PEO1 cells to the greatest extent, equivalent to patient derived CA-MSC-induced chemotherapy resistance (Fig6 C,D). D^{Hyp}-CS BM MSCs which did not develop a CA-MSC expression profile (classifier score of 0.03) likewise failed to significantly enhance chemotherapy resistance of cancer cells (Fig6D). Alternatively, D^{Hyp}-CS OV MSCs which acquired a near-CA-MSC expression profile (classifier score of 0.95) increased tumor cell chemotherapy resistance to levels equivalent to patient derived CA-MSCs (Fig6D). This indicates that the CA-MSC classification of cancer stimulated MSCs accurately corresponds with the ability to induce cancer cell chemotherapy resistance and supports the importance of the CA-MSC expression profile in imparting CA-MSC associated

chemotherapy resistance.

We next investigated if cancer stimulated MSCs impact ovarian CSCs by testing ovarian tumor sphere growth. MSCs were mixed with GFP-CAOV3 or GFP-PEO1 tumor cells in non-adherent conditions and tumor spheres counted. Tumor spheres grown with MSCs demonstrated mixed cellularity with GFP⁺ tumor cells growing within/surrounded by GFP⁻ MSCs (Fig6G). We observed that, relative to no MSC controls and OM MSC controls, *IV-CS* OM MSCs significantly enhanced tumor sphere numbers, equivalent to patient derived CA-MSCs (Fig6E). To confirm these results, spheres were dissociated and the number of GFP⁺ tumor cells assessed via FACs. *IV-CS* OM MSCs likewise enhanced the absolute number of viable tumor cells (Fig6F).

Ultimately, the primary functional feature of a CA-MSC is the ability to promote tumor growth *in vivo* [2, 7]. We therefore tested if *IV-CS* OM MSCs increase *in vivo* tumor growth similar to patient derived CA-MSCs. *IV-CS* OM MSCs were mixed with CAOV3 cells to create murine xenografts. Patient derived CA-MSCs or control OM MSCs were mixed with CAOV3 cells as control xenografts. Consistent with our previous results, patient derived CA-MSC containing tumors grew significantly faster and larger than tumors containing control OM MSC or control OV MSC or tumor cells alone (Fig7). Both *IV-CS* OM MSC and *IV-CS* OV MSCs promoted tumor growth at a rate equal or greater than patient derived CA-MSCs (Fig7B). These findings were repeated using PEO1 cancer cells likewise demonstrating growth enhancement with *IV-CS* OM MSCs (supFig 3).

Collectively, our results indicate that cancer stimulated-induction of a CA-MSC expression profile also conveys protumorigenic functional properties including tumor cell chemotherapy resistance, CSC enhancement and acceleration of *in vivo* tumor growth.

BM MSCs do not become CA-MSCs with ovarian cancer stimulation but demonstrate growth promoting properties after breast cancer stimulation. Unlike OM and OV MSCs, BM MSCs fail to acquire a CA-MSC expression profile or tumor promoting properties with any type of ovarian cancer cell stimulation. In fact, BM MSCs decreased ovarian xenograft growth (Fig7B) and could not be re-isolated from xenografts. As ovarian cancer rarely metastasizes to the bone, we investigated whether triple negative breast cancer, which frequently metastasizes to the bone but genetically resembles ovarian cancer, could be promoted by BM MSCs. We performed *in vivo* cancer stimulation (*IV-CS*) of BM MSCs with MDA-MB-231 cells (triple negative breast cancer cell line). BM MSCs mixed with breast cancer cells readily formed tumors but initially did not enhance xenograft growth compared to tumor cells alone (Fig 7C). The mixed cellularity xenografts were harvested and BM MSCs were re-isolated, propagated and characterized as above. The *IV-CS* BM MSCs were mixed with MDA-MB-231 cells to form xenografts. While the CA-MSC classifier score of breast cancer *IV-CS* BM MSC was only 0.17, *IV-CS* BM MSCs significantly enhanced breast tumor initiation and growth. This highlights the heterogeneity among sources of MSCs and their potential to develop a tumor-supporting phenotype which may be cancer-type specific.

Discussion:

Creation of a CA-MSc classifier: Unlike previous reports which focus on select molecular changes in tumor-associated MSCs, here we report the global expression differences between normal and cancer associated MSCs. We developed a robust algorithm which condenses these global changes into a 6-gene classifier which accurately distinguished not only ovarian cancer, but also endometrial and pancreatic derived CA-MSCs from normal MSCs. The classifier also distinguishes CA-MSCs from CAFs potentially clarifying another problematic area in the scientific literature. This classifier has the potential to be critical in the study of CA-MSCs allowing rapid, low cost validation.

CA-MSc are derived from normal MSCs exposed to the TME: Using the CA-MSc classifier we addressed the important question of what is the origin of CA-MSCs? Several studies have suggested MSCs migrate to sites of cancer from the bone marrow. However, while our studies cannot rule out rare MSC populations migrating to the TME, using labeled MSCs derived from various tissue sources stimulated with cancer cells *in vivo* we definitively show that local abdominal tissue derived MSCs can be reprogrammed to a CA-MSc. Even in an immunodeficient model, cancer stimulation effectively created a CA-MSc with the only difference vs patient derived CA-MSCs being TGFb2 expression which may indicate immune cells are important to drive this change. Interestingly, the MSC source is critical to the potential to support tumor growth as BM MSCs could only support breast cancer and not ovarian cancer growth. This differential capacity to become a CA-MSc is of great importance, implying that

MSCs may be critical to disease specific metastatic tropism. For example, ovarian cancer rarely metastasizes to the bone instead primarily residing within the intra-abdominal cavity and particularly in omental fat. Further, there is a clear tropism for ovarian cancer cells to colonize the ovary, especially considering most high grade serous ovarian cancers arise in the fallopian tube and the ovary may be the first metastatic site. In contrast, breast cancer readily metastasizes to bone and the ability of breast cancer cells to influence BM MSCs to promote growth may allow metastatic colonization of the bone niche. While clearly much more work is needed to fully understand this tissue and cancer type specificity, it is an intriguing area which may reveal critical insights into the disease specific patterns of metastasis. This tissue specificity may also explain the divergent reports in the literature regarding MSCs supporting or inhibiting cancer growth as results will depend on the pairing of MSC source and cancer type. Reports of BM MSCs supporting prostate and breast cancer growth but inhibiting ovarian cancer growth [20-22] are consistent with this concept.

Understanding the origin of CA-MSCs may also have significant therapeutic implications. Given the migratory activity and cancer tropism of MSCs, several studies have proposed using MSCs as therapeutic vehicles [23-26]. Our study suggests the source of MSCs in these studies is critical – BM MSCs could be effectively used in ovarian cancer but may be a poor source of MSCs for breast cancer studies.

Ultimately, discovering the origin of CA-MSCs is critical to understanding and eventually targeting the development of the pro-tumorigenic microenvironment. Mechanistically unraveling

how normal MSCs become CA-MSCs will allow development of treatments to prevent or reverse these changes thus blocking the tumor-supporting properties of CA-MSCs. Further, as CA-MSCs differentiate into multiple tumor stromal elements such as CAFs and adipocytes, targeting this progenitor cell may significantly alter the entire stromal TME. Also, if the conversion of a normal MSC into a CA-MSC is in part due to cancer secreted factors under hypoxic conditions, then as the tumor grows (locally and/or in metastatic deposits), secreted factors may act in a paracrine manner to influence near-by tissue MSCs to start to become CA-MSCs akin to a field effect creating more fertile “soil” for cancer cell propagation. By blocking these ongoing signals, we may prevent further spread of cancer by halting the creation of this “fertile soil.” Future work is needed to identify the critical factors which convert a normal tissue MSC into a CA-MSC. Also, understanding the factors which protect BM MSCs from developing into an ovarian CA-MSC will be critical to identifying targets to prevent and/or reverse the development of CA-MSCs.

Materials and methods

Tissue harvesting, culture

Patients samples were obtained in accordance with protocols approved by the University of Michigan's IRB (HUM0009149) and University of Pittsburgh's IRB (PRO17080326). Tissue was processed for RNA isolation as previously described [20]. MSCs were isolated as previously described [5]. Briefly, CA-MSCs were derived from surgical resection of human ovarian cancer involving the ovary and/or omental metastatic deposits. Normal omental, normal ovary and normal bone marrow MSCs were derived from surgical samples of women undergoing surgery for benign indications or benign bone marrow biopsy (provided as a kind gift from Dr. M. Wicha). Cells were plated in supplemented MEBM, MSCs were selected for plastic adherence and cell surface marker expression (CD105, CD90, CD73, CD44 positive; CD34, CD24, CD45 negative). Adipocyte, osteocyte, and chondrocyte differentiation capacity was verified (following guidelines presented by the ISCT on the minimal criteria for defining multipotent mesenchymal stem cells [9]). MSCs were maintained in culture as previously described and used at passage 8 or below [5] (see supplemental methods for further details). Endometrial and pancreatic CA-MSCs were obtained as above and as a kind gift from Dr. D. Simeone. Ovarian and omental fibroblasts were obtained from cancer tumor samples plated for plastic adherence and grown with connective tissue growth factor (100ng/ml) and ascorbic acid (50ug/ml) for 2 weeks (as described by Lee et al. [27]). Fibroblast differentiation was

verified by expression of FAP and FSP. Ovarian cancer cell lines SKOV3, CAOV-3 and PEO1 were obtained from ATCC. All cell lines were tested and verified negative for mycoplasma (last test 12/2017). Cancer cell lines were verified by ATCC.

In vitro indirect/direct co-culture, normoxic and hypoxic

Normal MSCs were grown in co-culture (indirect, direct \pm hypoxia) with GFP⁺ SKOV3 or CAOV3 or PEO1 cells. For indirect co-culture, 24mm polystyrene 0.4um transwell inserts with 5×10^4 MSCs on bottom, 5×10^4 tumor cells on top were used. For direct co-culture, 2×10^5 MSCs and 1×10^5 tumor cells were mixed in a T75cm dish. MSCs grown alone at equivalent cell numbers served as control. Co-cultures were performed for 5 days. Cells were grown at 21% O₂ for normoxic experiments and 1% O₂ for hypoxic experiments (Hypoxymon H35 Workstation, HypOxygen). Cells were sorted for mT⁺, GFP⁻ MSCs after direct co-culture with >99% purity with double sort as needed. For all experiments, each tumor cell line was used in a separate MSC co-culture. RNA expression changes and resulting classifier score was calculated separately for each experiment and values were averaged with SEM reported for each co-culture condition.

In vivo MSC and tumor cell co-growth

mT-labeled MSCs + GFP-labeled CAOV3 or PEO1 cells in a 1:1 ratio (0.5×10^6 cells each) were injected into the bilateral axilla of NSG mice. NSG (NOD.Cg-Prkdc^{scid}Il2rg^{tm1Wjl}/SzJ) mice were used for all experiments (female, age >6 weeks). mT-labeled BM MSCs + GFP-

labeled MDA-MB-231 breast cancer cells were also injected. Upon reaching 300-500mm³ (modified ellipsoid formula $(L*W^2)/2$) tumors were excised/processed into single cell suspensions and FAC sorted to isolate mT+/GFP- MSCs. MSCs were characterized for expression markers and differentiation capacity as above. *IV-CS OM MSCs* or *IV-CS OV MSCs* were mixed with CAOV3 or PEO1 cells in a 1:1 ratio (0.5×10^6 cells each) and injected into the bilateral axilla of NSG mice. Similarly, breast cancer *IV-CS BM MSCs* were mixed with MD-MBA-231 cells and injected as above. Control MSCs and patient derived CA-MSCs were grown with CAOV3, PEO1 or MDA-MB-231 cells as comparators. Five mice with bilateral tumor per group (n=10 tumors/group).

In vitro chemotherapy resistance assays

GFP+ CAOV3 or PEO1 cells were grown \pm MSCs (1:1 ratio, 20,000 total cells/24-well dish). I-CS, D-CS, I^{Hyp}-CS, D^{Hyp}-CS or *IV-CS BM MSCs*, OM MSCs and OV MSCs were compared to control MSCs and CA-MSCs. Tumor cells alone (20,000 cells/well) served as control. Cisplatin treatment lasted 24-48 hours. Viable GFP-tumor cells were analyzed via FACS using propidium iodide.

Tumor sphere assay

GFP+ CAOV3 or PEO1 cells were grown \pm *IV-CS OM MSCs* (1:1 ratio, 2,000 cells total) in 48-well non-adherent dishes in serum-free supplemented MEBM. Control MSCs or CA-MSCs

were comparators. After 7 days, GFP+ spheres were counted using fluorescent microscopy (Olympus BX41). Spheres were dissociated with trypsin and mechanical dispersion and FACs analyzed to quantify GFP+ tumor cells.

RNA sequencing and data processing

RNA was extracted from 4 OM-MSC samples and 10 CA-MSC samples per the TRIzol reagent manufacturer's extraction protocol (Invitrogen). 2ug of total RNA/sample was used for library preparation using the TruSeq RNA Sample Preparation v2 kit (Illumina) per the manufacturer's instructions using the Low Throughput protocol. Libraries were sequenced as paired-end 100bp on a HiSeq2000 instrument (Illumina) at the Peter MacCallum Cancer Centre. Each barcode-separated lane of sequencing data was aligned to the human reference genome and transcriptome (GRCh37) using Bowtie 2 version 2.2.3 [28] & TopHat2 v2.0.13 [29]. Between 64,000,000 and 113,000,000 paired reads were aligned to the transcriptome (supplemental methods). Estimation of gene abundance was carried out using HTSeq [30] which were log normalized prior to downstream analysis using the R-package Limma [31]. Specifically, differentially expressed genes between the OM-MSC and CA-MSC were identified, using the parameters of a log fold change (logFC) greater than + / - 2 and a p-value < 0.05. The RNAseq data has been deposited to NCBI's Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) and are accessible through GEO Series accession number GSE118624 (<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/query/acc.cgi?acc=GSE118624>).

CAMSC Classifier Creation

Gene expression heatmaps for CA-MSC and OM-MSC were created and compared using the “heatmap” package. To statistically evaluate the degree of data variability, principal components analysis (PCA) was run on the top-50 univariate p-value genes using the “PCA” and “fviz_pca” functions in R, with an ellipse alpha = 0.95 for graphical visualization. The signal to discriminate between the CA-MSC and OM-MSC groups was confirmed by hierarchical clustering analysis to optimize the Ward distance over k=2 groups using packages “FactoMineR” and “factoextra”. To further reduce the data, gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) was performed using the Sergushichev algorithm and corresponding “fgsea” package [32]. We provided the “CA-MSC” or “OM-MSC” class and RNAseq data for each of the 14 individuals. Enrichment values were created over 10,000 permutations, and an adjusted p-value of 0.05 revealed 27 differentially enriched genes. These 27 differentially enriched genes identified from RNAseq were verified via independent qRT-PCR on 10 additional independent CA-MSC and 8 independent OM-MSC samples (2 of the 27 genes, CLND1 and EVPL, failed independent validation and were excluded yielding a final 25-gene set). Using the qRT-PCR data, we used cross-validated L1-norm constrained logistic regression [33] (CV-LASSO) to select a predictive subset of genes to discriminate between the CA-MSC and non-CA-MSC groups. Using the “glmnet” package, we minimized the cross-validation misclassification error to select the largest optimum L1-norm constraint value lambda and extracted the non-zero classifier model coefficients from the full PCR data.

Experimental predictions were generated by fitting validation experiment PCR data to this CV-LASSO generated model and comparing predicted and true cancer cell exposures. The threshold for assignment from the logistic regression was 0.5. All programming was performed in R 3.1.0 [34].

Statistics

All *in vitro* experiments were repeated independently at least three times with triplicate samples per experiment unless otherwise stated. Statistical significance was evaluated using a 2-sided student's T-test. For all experiments, $\alpha=0.05$. For animal studies, $n=10$ per group based on final tumor volume of control animals of $\sim 1000\text{mm}^3$ with an expected standard deviation of 30%.

Non-linear regression analysis of tumor growth over time was performed for each group and curves compared to determine statistical significance. In all figures, error bars represent standard error of the mean of composite values from independent experiments.

Study approval

Animal studies were performed with approval of the University Committee on Use and Care of Animals of the University of Michigan. Patients samples were obtained in accordance with a protocol approved by the University of Michigan's IRB (HUM0009149) and University of Pittsburgh's IRB (PRO17080326). Written informed consent was received from participants prior to inclusion in the studies. Recombinant DNA work was performed in accordance with the NIH Guidelines for Research Involving Recombinant or Synthetic Nucleic Acid Molecules

Quantitative real-time PCR and Immunoblotting are detailed in supplementary methods.

1. Surveillance, E., and End Results (SEER) Program (www.seer.cancer.gov) Research Data (1973-2010), National Cancer Institute, DCCPS, Surveillance Research Program, Surveillance Systems Branch, released April 2013, based on the November 2012 submission.
2. McLean, K., et al., *Human ovarian carcinoma-associated mesenchymal stem cells regulate cancer stem cells and tumorigenesis via altered BMP production*. J Clin Invest, 2011. **121**(8): p. 3206-3219.
3. Musrap, N. and E.P. Diamandis, *Revisiting the complexity of the ovarian cancer microenvironment--clinical implications for treatment strategies*. Mol Cancer Res, 2012. **10**(10): p. 1254-1264.
4. Nieman, K.M., et al., *Adipocytes promote ovarian cancer metastasis and provide energy for rapid tumor growth*. Nat Med, 2011. **17**(11): p. 1498-1503.
5. da Silva Meirelles, L., P.C. Chagastelles, and N.B. Nardi, *Mesenchymal stem cells reside in virtually all post-natal organs and tissues*. J Cell Sci, 2006. **119**(Pt 11): p. 2204-2213.
6. Kolf, C.M., E. Cho, and R.S. Tuan, *Mesenchymal stromal cells. Biology of adult mesenchymal stem cells: regulation of niche, self-renewal and differentiation*. Arthritis Res Ther, 2007. **9**(1): p. 204.
7. Coffman, L.G., et al., *Human carcinoma-associated mesenchymal stem cells promote ovarian cancer chemotherapy resistance via a BMP4/HH signaling loop*. Oncotarget, 2016. **7**(6): p. 6916-6932.
8. Dominici, M., et al., *Minimal criteria for defining multipotent mesenchymal stromal cells. The International Society for Cellular Therapy position statement*. Cytotherapy, 2006. **8**(4): p. 315-317.
9. Verardo, R., et al., *Specific mesothelial signature marks the heterogeneity of mesenchymal stem cells from high-grade serous ovarian cancer*. Stem Cells, 2014. **32**(11): p. 2998-3011.
10. Dewhirst, M.W., Y. Cao, and B. Moeller, *Cycling hypoxia and free radicals regulate angiogenesis and radiotherapy response*. Nat Rev Cancer, 2008. **8**(6): p. 425-437.
11. Hockel, M. and P. Vaupel, *Tumor hypoxia: definitions and current clinical, biologic, and molecular aspects*. J Natl Cancer Inst, 2001. **93**(4): p. 266-276.
12. Ejtehadifar, M., et al., *The Effect of Hypoxia on Mesenchymal Stem Cell Biology*. Adv Pharm Bull, 2015. **5**(2): p. 141-149.

13. Price, B.D. and S.K. Calderwood, *Gadd45 and Gadd153 messenger RNA levels are increased during hypoxia and after exposure of cells to agents which elevate the levels of the glucose-regulated proteins*. *Cancer Res*, 1992. **52**(13): p. 3814-3817.
14. Furuta, C., et al., *Transforming growth factor-beta signaling enhancement by long-term exposure to hypoxia in a tumor microenvironment composed of Lewis lung carcinoma cells*. *Cancer Sci*, 2015. **106**(11): p. 1524-1533.
15. Han, W.Q., et al., *Hypoxia-inducible factor prolyl-hydroxylase-2 mediates transforming growth factor beta 1-induced epithelial-mesenchymal transition in renal tubular cells*. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, 2013. **1833**(6): p. 1454-1462.
16. Jun, J.H., et al., *Erythropoietin prevents hypoxia-induced GATA-4 ubiquitination via phosphorylation of serine 105 of GATA-4*. *Biol Pharm Bull*, 2013. **36**(7): p. 1126-1133.
17. Suzuki, Y.J., *Cell signaling pathways for the regulation of GATA4 transcription factor: Implications for cell growth and apoptosis*. *Cell Signal*, 2011. **23**(7): p. 1094-1099.
18. Beaufort, C.M., et al., *Ovarian cancer cell line panel (OCCP): clinical importance of in vitro morphological subtypes*. *PLoS One*, 2014. **9**(9): p. e103988.
19. Domcke, S., et al., *Evaluating cell lines as tumour models by comparison of genomic profiles*. *Nat Commun*, 2013. **4**: p. 2126.
20. Karnoub, A.E., et al., *Mesenchymal stem cells within tumour stroma promote breast cancer metastasis*. *Nature*, 2007. **449**(7162): p. 557-563.
21. Ye, H., et al., *Human bone marrow-derived mesenchymal stem cells produced TGFbeta contributes to progression and metastasis of prostate cancer*. *Cancer Invest*, 2012. **30**(7): p. 513-518.
22. Bruno, S., et al., *Microvesicles derived from human bone marrow mesenchymal stem cells inhibit tumor growth*. *Stem Cells Dev*, 2013. **22**(5): p. 758-771.
23. Marofi, F., et al., *Mesenchymal Stromal/Stem Cells: A New Era in the Cell-Based Targeted Gene Therapy of Cancer*. *Front Immunol*, 2017. **8**: p. 1770.
24. Sharif, S., M.H. Ghahremani, and M. Soleimani, *Delivery of Exogenous miR-124 to Glioblastoma Multiform Cells by Wharton's Jelly Mesenchymal Stem Cells Decreases Cell Proliferation and Migration, and Confers Chemosensitivity*. *Stem Cell Rev*, 2017.
25. Petrella, F., et al., *Paclitaxel-releasing mesenchymal stromal cells inhibit in vitro proliferation of human mesothelioma cells*. *Biomed Pharmacother*, 2017. **87**: p. 755-758.
26. Petrella, F., et al., *Mesenchymal Stromal Cells for Antineoplastic Drug Loading and Delivery*. *Medicines (Basel)*, 2017. **4**(4).
27. Lee, C.H., E.K. Moiola, and J.J. Mao, *Fibroblastic differentiation of human mesenchymal stem cells using connective tissue growth factor*. *Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc*, 2006. **1**: p. 775-778.
28. Langmead, B. and S.L. Salzberg, *Fast gapped-read alignment with Bowtie 2*. *Nat Methods*, 2012. **9**(4): p. 357-359.
29. Kim, D., et al., *TopHat2: accurate alignment of transcriptomes in the presence of insertions, deletions and gene fusions*. *Genome Biol*, 2013. **14**(4): p. R36.
30. Anders, S., P.T. Pyl, and W. Huber, *HTSeq--a Python framework to work with high-throughput sequencing data*. *Bioinformatics*, 2015. **31**(2): p. 166-169.

31. Ritchie, M.E., et al., *limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies*. Nucleic Acids Res, 2015. **43**(7): p. e47.
32. Sergushichev, A., *An algorithm for fast preranked gene set enrichment analysis using cumulative statistic calculation*. bioRxiv, 2016.
33. Friedman, J., T. Hastie, and R. Tibshirani, *Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent*. J Stat Softw, 2010. **33**(1): p. 1-22.
34. Team, R.D.C., *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, 2008.